



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

that if premises have been used as a playground for children for a long time, and have been safe for that period, and the owner makes a dangerous excavation or erection on them, which he leaves unguarded, it would be in the nature of a trap which would make him liable for injuries caused by it. 26 L. R. A. 687 and cases there cited. *Penso v. McCormick*, 125 Ind. 116; *Indianapolis v. Emmelman*, 108 Ind. 530.

PARENT AND CHILD—DUTY OF FATHER TO SUPPORT NOT ENFORCEABLE IN EQUITY.—Where a father had abandoned his children, and they had filed a bill in equity for a decree against him for a monthly maintenance allowance, to be made a lien upon his property. *Held*, that there was no authority for the assumption of equity jurisdiction in such a case, and that it would be against public policy and family unity to extend its jurisdiction to cover a suit of a child against its father. There was a strong dissenting opinion. *Rawlings v. Rawlings*, (Miss., 1919) 83 So. 146.

By the common law of England—which was followed in a few early American cases—a father was not legally bound to support his infant child, and would not be liable for necessities furnished for the support of the child. *Urmston v. Newcomen*, 4 Ad. & El. 899; *Mortimer v. Wright*, 6 Mees. & W. 482; *Kelley v. Davis*, 49 N. H. 187; *Hunt v. Thompson*, 3 Scam. (Ill.) 179; *Gordon v. Potter*, 17 Vt. 348. But this doctrine has not been followed by the majority of American courts. *Dunbar v. Dunbar*, 190 U. S. 340; *Brown v. Brown*, 132 Ga. 712; *Gilley v. Gilley*, 79 Me. 292; and many others. See 13 MICH. L. REV. 345; 20 R. C. L. 622. However the remedy at law is very inadequate, since it requires credit to the infant, and generally a suit to recover for the necessities. So there is much force in the argument of the dissenting opinion that such a remedy at law is inadequate for the infant. Now inadequacy of the remedy at law is a ground for equity jurisdiction, where there is an existing legal duty. *Garland v. Garland*, 50 Miss. 694; *Prather v. Prather*, 4 Dess. (S. C.) 33; *Glover v. Glover*, 16 Ala. 440. In these last cited cases, a wife was allowed to recover an allowance for her support from her husband, without a divorce. Also where the wife has brought a bill in equity for the maintenance and support of the children, it has been allowed. *Leibold v. Leibold*, 158 Ind. 60; *De Brauwere v. De Brauwere*, 203 N. Y. 460, commented on in 10 MICH. L. REV. 415. In many other cases equity courts have said that they had full jurisdiction over minors. *Williams v. Duncan*, 44 Miss. 375; *Johns v. Smith*, 56 Miss. 727. Nor has equity hesitated to make an allowance out of a minor's estate for its maintenance and support, where the father was unable to support the child at all, or in a station befitting its expectancy. *Watts v. Steele*, 19 Ala. 656. So from the above it does not seem that equity would have had much difficulty in assuming jurisdiction in such a case as the principal one. However the majority of the court, in the principal case, thought it was against public policy and family interests, to allow a suit by a minor in equity directly against its father. And in support of their contention they had the only authority, directly in point. *Huke v. Huke*, 44 Mo. App. 308.